JS 44 (Rev. 07/16)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS HELEN SWARTZ, Individually			DEFENDANTS HILTON HOTELS CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			NOTE: IN LAND CO	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF CASES, USE TO OF LAND INVOLVED.	· ·
Grove, PA 19090, 215.4	nddress, and Telephone Number) n, Moses & Rossito, 600 Easton 96.2902 & Fuller, Fuller & Assoc FL 33181, 305.891.5199		Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U,S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in		en of Another State	2	
IV. MATURE OF CHIE			en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)	T FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education □ 560 Civil I Condit Condit	AL INJURY and Injury - tet Liability 69 1 Care/ acceutical and Injury et Liability tos Personal Product ity L PROPERTY Fraud in Lending Personal ty Damage et Liability PETTHONS Orpus: Detainee ns to Vacate ice al Penalty mus & Other Rights Condition Detainee - tions of	DREITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 00 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 10 Labor/Management Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 11 Family and Medical Leave Act 10 Other Labor Litigation 12 Employee Retirement 1 Income Security Act 1 MMIGRATION 15 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	noved from 3 Remanded from Appellate Co	nich you are filing (I h Disabilities Act	pened Another (specify) On not cite jurisdictional state 1, 42 USC Sec. 1218	r District Litigation Transfer utes unless diversity): 1, et seq.	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.		EMAND \$		if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE S 3 17	signayo	NE OPAYTORNIAY C	Pere		
	IOUNT APPLY	YING IFP	IUDGE	MAG IUT	OGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HELEN SWARTZ, Individu	ıally,	
------------------------	--------	--

Plaintiff,

V.

HILTON HOTELS CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation,

Case No.

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ, Individually, on her behalf and on behalf of all other mobility-impaired individuals similarly-situated, (sometimes referred to as "Plaintiff"), hereby sues the Defendant, HILTON HOTELS CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation (sometimes referred to as "Defendant") for Injunctive Relief, and attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. ("ADA").

- 1. Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ, resides in Miami Beach, Florida, in the County of Miami-Dade.
- 2. Defendant's property, Embassy Suites Philadelphia City Center, is a hotel located at 1776 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103, in the County of Philadelphia.
- 3. Venue is properly located in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because venue lies in the judicial district of the property situs. The Defendant's property is located in and does business within this judicial district.

- 4. Pursuant to 28 USC § 1331 and 28 USC § 1343, this Court has been given original jurisdiction over actions which arise from the Defendant's violations of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. See, also, 28 USC § 2201 and § 2202.
- 5. Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ is a Florida resident, is sui juris, has multiple sclerosis and relies on the use of an electric scooter to ambulate, as she is mobility impaired. She qualifies as a person with disabilities, as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Helen Swartz was born and raised in New York City and moved to the Philadelphia area in 1978 to attend graduate school. After completion of her studies, she founded a business and resided in the area until 2011. She was active in the business community and has many long-standing relationships that she has maintained throughout the years. She also had two children during those years, through which she knew many people.

Her elder daughter and granddaughter live in the surrounding area and she often meets them in Center City, Philadelphia, so that they may enjoy cultural activities, dining and shopping in Philadelphia. She has often taken her granddaughter to the Museum of Natural History and Please Touch Museums in Philadelphia. Ms. Swartz also enjoys meeting her Philadelphia-based friends in various restaurants and attending local shows in Philadelphia.

Helen Swartz visited the property which forms the basis of this lawsuit, and has reservations to return to the property to avail herself of the goods and services offered to the public at the property, if the facilities are fully accessible and the barriers to access have been corrected. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers at the subject property, which have impaired her use of the facilities and the amenities offered, and have endangered her safety at the facilities and her ability to access the facilities and use the restrooms.

- 6. HELEN SWARTZ has patronized the hotel which forms the basis of this lawsuit on several occasions. She plans to return to the facility in the near future, once the facility is made accessible, to avail herself of the goods and services offered to the public at the property.
- 7. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers at the subject property, which are enumerated in paragraph 11. The barriers to access at the property have endangered her safety, and adversely affected her ability to use the facilities.
- 8. Defendant owns, leases, leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201(a) and 36.104. Defendant is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that the Defendant owns, operatse, leases or leases to is known as Embassy Suites Philadelphia City Center, and is located at 1776 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103, in the County of Philadelphia.
- 9. HELEN SWARTZ has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with respect to this property as described but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Paragraph 11 of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that she will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the ADA by the Defendant. HELEN SWARTZ desires to visit Embassy Suites Philadelphia City Center not only to avail herself of the goods and services available at the property but to assure herself that these property are in compliance with the ADA so that she and others similarly-situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the property without fear of discrimination.

- 10. The Defendant has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying her access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the hotel, as prohibited by 42 USC § 12182 et seq.
- 11. The Defendant has discriminated, and is continuing to discriminate, against the Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing to, <u>inter alia</u>, have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A preliminary inspection of the Embassy Suites Philadelphia City Center has shown that violations exist. These violations which HELEN SWARTZ personally observed or encountered, and which were verified by an ADA expert, include, but are not limited to:
 - a. The ramp does not have proper handrails. This is in violation of section 505.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
 - b. The check-in counter is too high. This is in violation of section 904.3.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
 - c. Accessible seating is not provided at tables inside and outside of the hotel. This is in violation of sections 226 and 902 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design.
 - d. A maneuvering clearance is not provided to exit the gym. This is in violation of section 404.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
 - e. Items in the gym are out of reach. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
 - f. Accessible signage is missing from permanent spaces. This is in violation of section 216.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
 - g. The accessible signage is on the pull side of the door. This is in violation of section 703.4.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
 - h. The assorted accessible toilet compartments do not have compliant grab

bars by the water closets. This is in violation of section 604.5 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.

- i. The location of the water closet is inaccessible. This is in violation of section 604.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- j. Accessible door hardware is missing from both sides of the accessible toilet stall doors. This is in violation of section 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- k. The toilet paper seat cover dispensers are out of reach in the accessible toilet compartments. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- l. The mirror in the accessible toilet compartment is too high. This is in violation of section 603.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- m. The balcony that serves the guest room is not accessible. This is in violation of section 806.2.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- n. A clear floor space is not provided to access the closet in the accessible guestroom. This is in violation of section 811.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- o. In the accessible guestroom bathroom the shower unit is too high in the roll-in shower. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- p. A fixed seat is not provided in the accessible guestroom roll-in shower. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- q. The table in accessible guestroom is not accessible. This is in violation of section 806.2.1 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- r. Items in the accessible guestroom and bathroom are out of reach. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. §36.304.
- s. The hotel does not provide the required amount of accessible guest rooms. This is in violation of section 224 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design.

§36.304.

Maintenance

- t. The accessible features of the facility are not maintained, creating barriers to access for the Plaintiff, as set forth herein, in violation of 28 CFR §36.211.
- 12. All of the foregoing cited violations are violations of both the 1991 Americans with Disabilities Act Guidelines (ADAAG) and the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, as adopted by the Department of Justice.
- 13. The discriminatory violations described in Paragraph 11 are not an exclusive list of the Defendant's ADA violations. Plaintiff requires the inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and all of the barriers to access. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly-situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied the benefits of services, programs and activities of the Defendant's facilities, and have otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendant because of the Defendant's ADA violations, as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly-situated will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 14. Defendant have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying her access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility in violation of 42 USC § 12181 *et seq.* and 28 CFR. 36.302 *et seq.* Furthermore, the Defendant continue to

discriminate against the Plaintiff, and all those similarly-situated by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

- 15. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm. Considering the balance of hardships between the Plaintiff and Defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted. Furthermore, the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses from the Defendant pursuant to 42 USC § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.
- 16. Defendant is required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled, when such removal is readily achievable for its place of public accommodation that has existed prior to January 26, 1992, 28 CFR 36.304(a); in the alternative, if there has been an alteration to Defendant's place of public accommodation since January 26, 1992, then the Defendant is required to ensure to the maximum extent feasible, that the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use walkers and wheelchairs, 28 CFR 36.402; and finally, if the Defendant's facility is one which was designed and constructed for first occupancy subsequent to January 26, 1993, as defined in 28 CFR 36.401, then the Defendant's facility must be readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA.
- 17. Notice to Defendant is not required as a result of the Defendant's failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant have 10 or fewer

employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by the Defendant.

18. Pursuant to 42 USC § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to require the Defendant to alter the Embassy Suites - Philadelphia City Center to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other persons with disabilities as defined by the ADA; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendant cure its violations of the ADA. The Order shall further require the Defendant to maintain the required assessable features on an ongoing basis.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests:

- a. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that determines that the Defendant at the commencement of the subject lawsuit are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq.
- b. Injunctive relief against the Defendant including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facility; or to make such facility readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require the Defendant to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

- c. An award of attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42
 USC § 12205.
- d. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Dessen, Esq. (I.D. 17627)

Dessen, Moses & Rossito

600 Easton Road

Willow Grove, PA 19090

Telephone: 215.496.2902 Facsimile: 215.564.2879 ddessen@dms-lawyer.com

and

Lawrence A. Fuller, Esq., pro hac vice pending

Fuller, Fuller & Associates, P.A.

12000 Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 502

North Miami, FL 33181 Telephone: 305.891.5199 Facsimile: 305.893.9505 Ifuller@fullerfuller.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

HELEN SWARTZ, Individually,	
v.	CIVIL ACTION NO.
HILTON HOTELS CORPORATION	

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

215-658-1400 Telephone	215-658-0747 FAX Number	ddessen@dms-lawyer.com E-Mail Address			
8 3 17 Date	David S. Dessen Attorney-at-law				
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not fall into any	y one of the other tracks.	(X)		
e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)					
 d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. 					
c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.				

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:17-cv-03546-EAMED STATES PIECTOS 12 Page 12 of 12

Address of Plaintiff: HELEN SWARTZ, 1330 West Ave., Miami Beach, FL 33139

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Defendant: 7 St. Paul Street, Suite 820, Baltimore, MD 21202 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: EMBASSY SUITES - PHILADELPHIA, 1776 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Philadelphia, PA (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) No X Yes□ Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: _ Date Terminated Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? No L Yes□ 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? No□ CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: 1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 2.

Airplane Personal Injury 3.

Jones Act-Personal Injury 3.

Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5.

Patent 5.

Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. ☐ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. X Civil Rights 7.

Products Liability 8.

Habeas Corpus 8.
Products Liability — Asbestos 9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases 10. ☐ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. ☐ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) I, David S. Dessen , counsel of record do hereby certify: ☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: David S. Dessen Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. David S. Dessen

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

Attorney-at-Law